

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 10, 2008 notes that claims 1-18 are pending, claim 17 is withdrawn, claim 5 is allowed, claims 6-7 are objected to, and claims 1-4, 8-16, and 18 are rejected. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 18 are amended. No claims are cancelled and no new claims are added. No new matter is believed to be presented and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. The rejections and objections are traversed below.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Personal Interview on 15 December 2008 and incorporates the substance of the Interview into the Response.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, on page 2, in item 4, claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (Designing Web Usability) in view of Ryan (US Pub. No. 20030152207). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Nielsen discusses use of video on the Web but notes that there are issues with playback of video on the Web because bandwidth restraints require video on the Web to be of lower quality. In particular, Nielsen notes that audio in the video may be difficult to understand if a speaker is sloppy, has a dialect, speaks over a distracting soundtrack, or speaks too quickly, thus requiring subtitles to supplement the audio. Further, when a video has subtitles and is converted for playback on the internet, the subtitles can become unreadable when the video is converted and quality reduced for playback over the Internet. However, Nielsen discusses placing the subtitles into a letterbox which compresses better. Nielsen also discusses breaking down longer videos into smaller segments for easier playback over the Web. (See Nielsen, pages 1-2).

Ryan merely discusses streaming a sound and/or video file such that it can be viewed or heard as it is being downloaded, rather than waiting for the entire file to download. (See Ryan, paragraph [0080]).

In light of the above discussion, claim 1, as amended patentably distinguishes over Nielsen and Ryan, either alone or in combination. Nothing cited in the Office Action or found in Nielsen or Ryan teaches **"modify and synchronize a playing time period of said media other than said text media** included in said spatiotemporal layout information, **on the basis of said**

display time period of said text media set as said spatiotemporal layout information.” As discussed in the Personal Interview of 15 December 2008, the text media controls the display time of the other media and the playing time period of said other media than said text media is modified and synchronized based on the time period required for said text media. Nielsen merely discusses compressing a video file with subtitles in a letterbox and that having the subtitles in a letterbox allows the subtitle portion of the video to be compressed without distorting the text.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites “converting input multimedia contents, including text media and media other than the text media, oriented to personal computer to be displayed on a screen of the personal computer with a predetermined size into said output multimedia contents oriented to portable terminal with a size smaller than said predetermined size on the basis of said spatiotemporal layout information.” The “text media and media other than the text media” is converted to be displayed on a smaller screen. Thus, after the text is converted, text may take longer to scroll on a smaller screen. (See Application, page 21, line 20-page 22, line 17 and Figure 11). This is why it may be necessary to “modify and synchronize a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information, on the basis of said display time period of said text media set as said spatiotemporal layout information.” This distinction is not taught or suggested by Nielsen or Ryan, either alone or in combination. Thus, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen and Ryan.

Claim 8, as amended, recites “a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information is modified and synchronized on the basis of said display time period of said text media set as said spatiotemporal layout information.” Thus, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen and Ryan, either alone or in combination for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 12, as amended, recites “a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information is modified and synchronized on the basis of said display time period of said text media set as the spatiotemporal layout information.” Thus, claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen and Ryan, either alone or in combination for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 18, as amended, recites “modifying and synchronizing a playing time period of audio and video media in consideration with a calculated display time period of a scrolling text media as playing time information.” Thus, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen and Ryan, either alone or in combination for reasons similar to those discussed above.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 4 recites "a repeat count setting processing unit for setting a repeat count of said media other than said text media on the basis of said display time period of said text media calculated in said text display time calculation processing unit and said total playing time period of all said segments of said media other than said text media." Stated another way, the cited references do not teach repeating media other than text media to make the display time of the media other than the text media correspond with the text media which may take longer to scroll on a smaller screen than a larger screen. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the cited references.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 is amended merely to remove an informality found in the claim and thus it is submitted that claim 5 remains allowable. The Office Action on page 9, in item 14 notes that claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, claim 6 depends upon claim 5, and thus it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is also allowable. Claim 7 is amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, and thus it is submitted that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/774,630

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/12/19

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501